

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
OXFORD DIVISION**

RITA MORAES

PLAINTIFF

VS.

CIVIL ACTION NO.: 3:14-cv-203-DMB-JMV

THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI

DEFENDANT

ORDER STAYING CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS

Local Uniform Civil Rule 16(b)(3)(B) provides that “[f]iling...an immunity defense ... motion stays the attorney conference and disclosure requirements and all discovery **not related** to the issue pending the court’s ruling on the motion, including any appeal.” L.U. Civ. R. 16(b)(3)(B) (emphasis added). Because the defendant has raised the issue of immunity by separate motion [6], staying certain proceedings is appropriate.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that the aforementioned proceedings are hereby **STAYED** as aforesaid pending a ruling on the immunity motion. Should the parties desire to undertake immunity related discovery, they should contact the court for scheduling of same. Defendants shall notify the undersigned magistrate judge within seven (7) days of a decision on the immunity defense motion and shall submit a proposed order lifting the stay.

SO ORDERED this, the 21st day of October, 2014.

/s/ Jane M. Virden

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE